

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 23 has been amended to additionally recite features recited in claims 1, 6 and 19. In addition, claims 7, 11 and 17 have been amended to correct the informalities. In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Borr* of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,351 (*Borr*). The Examiner's rejection is fully traversed below.

It is respectfully submitted that *Borr* does NOT teach a file-system-independent component of an operating system that effectively implements mandatory locks for a file system that does NOT provide mandatory locks for files that are stored in the file system and are accessible to the operating system. As such, it is respectfully submitted that *Borr* does NOT teach the combination of features recited in claim 23. It should be noted that *Borr* does NOT teach a secure mechanism for changing the size of a file stored in the file system that does NOT provide mandatory locks.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 and its dependent claims are patentable over *Borr* for at least this reason. Furthermore, these dependent claims recite additional features that render them patentable over *Borr* for additional reasons. For example, claim 19 recites: identify a region of said file which would be affected by changing the size of said file when it is determined that a mandatory Byte-Range lock has been associated with the file. Still further, claim 20 additionally recites allowing the resizing request when it is determined that the identified region does not interact with said locked region of said file.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any

further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. SUN1P722). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300